

# 2010 LEGISLATIVE ROUNDTABLE

## DOT EXERCISE RESULTS

Red = Paid Districts, Green = Combination Districts, Volunteer Districts

### Funding (4 Issues, 122 Total Dots)

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Sales tax on capital equipment.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Currently pay sales tax on all capital purchases.	12	21	15
<b>Solution</b>	Rebate on sales tax for capital purchase or dedicate taxes to support fire services.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
		48		
<b>Benefits</b>	Saves money for fire districts and reduces double taxation.			
<b>Cons</b>	Reduces revenue for state and counties.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Unknown.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire Service.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	State and county government.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Super majority on all fire levies and bonds.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	State constitution requires 60% majority on all levy and bonds.	23	8	3
<b>Solution</b>	Amend state constitution to allow simple majority for bonds and levies.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
		34		
<b>Benefits</b>	Better able to get approval for levies and bonds. Reduced election costs for majority rule.			
<b>Cons</b>	Might impact simple majority for lid lift.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire service.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Other taxing districts if not included.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Simple majority for EMS levies and remove validation.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>		10	13	5
<b>Solution</b>		<b>Total Dots</b>		
		28		
<b>Benefits</b>				
<b>Cons</b>				
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>				
<b>Who Supports?</b>				
<b>Who Opposes?</b>				

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Cash flow for fire districts requires large cash carry over for the first five months.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
		6	6	0
<b>Background</b>	The current system is antiquated for when accounting was done by hand rather than computerization which is done today.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
		12		
<b>Solution</b>	Allow for monthly property tax payments.			
<b>Benefits</b>	Reduce size of cash carry over balance.			
<b>Cons</b>	None.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Possible additional cost to county treasurers.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Local districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Mortgage companies.			

## Regulations (2 Issues, 101 Total Dots)

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	No requirement for residential fire sprinkler systems.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Statistics show benefit - builders resist due to cost.	33	21	8
<b>Solution</b>	Adopt code (2009) IRC sprinkler requirements.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Fire district ISO rating. Less loss of properties. Increased development in urban areas. Reduced insurance premiums.	62		
<b>Cons</b>	Increased construction costs. Liability to utility districts. Unknown additional liability issues. Lack of consistency in insurance industry.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	To the state: 0. To the property owner: minimal.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire service, insurance companies, utility providers (if liability issues resolved) and mechanical contractors association.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Builders, developers, and rural property owners.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Unfunded mandates are not thoroughly evaluated regarding fiscal impact on local (rural) districts.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Mandates negatively impact the ability of fire districts to deliver EMS/Fire Service(s). Example DOH requiring EMS personnel to pass national registry test.	12	18	9
<b>Solution</b>	Formal monitoring process to gather fiscal/non-fiscal impacts on districts/departments both legislative and regulatory.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Stabilize: budget, fiscal impacts, planning, service levels, rates to taxpayer.	39		
<b>Cons</b>	Extra workload.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	To the state: 0.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire service, EMS services, cities, special purpose districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	DOH and L&I.			

## Volunteer Issues (4 Issues, 83 Total Dots)

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Retention and recruitment issues.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Losing volunteers - hard to keep current volunteers.	7	17	13
<b>Solution</b>	License plates. Lower retirement age. Statewide publicity. Improve pension districts.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	No cost recognition (volunteer pays). Recognition public education.	37		
<b>Cons</b>	Cost of advertising.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Impacts state budget.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	All volunteers.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Union.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Retention and recruitment incentive.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Losing volunteers hard to keep current volunteers.	1	6	14
<b>Solution</b>	Survivor benefit continued to spouse.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>		21		
<b>Cons</b>	Cost.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>				
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Volunteer firefighters.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Insurance companies.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Volunteers lose unemployment benefits when paid by districts.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>		1	10	4
<b>Solution</b>	Volunteer firefighters wages do not go against unemployment benefits.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Retain volunteers.	15		
<b>Cons</b>	Unemployment will have to pay.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	State.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Unemployment.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Training requirements for volunteers too time consuming and not appropriate to district.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	L & I having authority to impose excessive fines on fire districts.	1	6	3
<b>Solution</b>	Limit fines don't take tax payers money but fix the problem.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	RCW and L&I requirements should match the risk and needs of district.	10		
<b>Cons</b>	L&I not likely to enforce.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Funds collected not going to general fund.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	L&I.			

Governance (6 Issues, 87 Total Dots)				
Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	7 member board not allowed by RCWs.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Lack of representation 7 dist + 3 cities > 5 members current.	33	0	0
<b>Solution</b>	Change RCW to <u>allow</u> 7 person board.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Provide assured represent - allows opportunity for efficiencies. 3 member commit.	33		
<b>Cons</b>	\$9,600.00 per.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None at state level/local only.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	WFCA/PCFCA/PCCA.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Anti government orgs.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Fire authorities cannot combine if non-contiguous borders.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Districts/FA to not touch but have mutual interests and goals.	12	12	0
<b>Solution</b>	Change Title 52 to allow.			
<b>Benefits</b>	Allows increased efficiencies.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Cons</b>	Turf war/crossing state lands/district fed land etc.	24		
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None at state level.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Senate 44/0 2010, fire districts and RFAs.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Cities/some fire districts.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Lack of provision for late comers to join RFA.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	No current ability for late comers to join RFA.	8	4	0
<b>Solution</b>	Change to Title 52 to allow additional members to join after initial formation.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	See solution.	12		
<b>Cons</b>	Too large/powerful?			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	RFAs/fire districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Some fire districts?			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Fire districts not able to provide mandated training.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Funding from state for regional training has disappeared.	0	9	0
<b>Solution</b>	Use 086 funds for regional training. Continue firefighter training. Establish clear legislative intent for use of 086 funds.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Helps meet requirements established by state.	9		
<b>Cons</b>				
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None - funds already exist.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire service especially smaller districts.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	OFM and WSP.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Providing services to no man's land is costly for gifting public funds.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Fed, state for private lands not covered by fire districts.	1	8	0
<b>Solution</b>	Stakeholder group to work with legislature. Landowner/buyer education.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Fight smaller fires sooner. More funds to fire districts.	9		
<b>Cons</b>	Funding is complicated! State can't pay.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	State? Taxpayer? More taxes?			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Fire districts, tax payer/land owners.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Same?			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Two RFAs cannot join together.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	Unable to combine 2 because of lack of enabling legislation.	0	0	0
<b>Solution</b>	Change Title 52 to allow.	<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Benefits</b>	Cost efficiencies.	0		

<b>Cons</b>		
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	None to state.	
<b>Who Supports?</b>	RFAs.	
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Anti government (maybe)/anti change.	

### Miscellaneous (3 Issues, 45 Total Dots)

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Retirement not being funded by state (PERS, LEOFF).	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	State has not funded their part employee contribution has been reduced.	11	5	1
		<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Solution</b>	State needs to pay their portion employee contribution needs to go back up. Not allow state to neglect funding.	17		
<b>Benefits</b>	Keep state out of bankruptcy. Fund is solvent.			
<b>Cons</b>	Redirects monies from other general fund programs.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Money delay.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Everyone in system: cities, fire districts and counties.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Special interest groups in general fund.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Gap in LEOFF 2 coverage to retirement age.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	State left out coverage when they switched from LEOFF 1 to LEOFF 2.	11	4	0
		<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Solution</b>	Extend coverage to fill gaps.	15		
<b>Benefits</b>	A person can retire at a healthier age! Equity!			
<b>Cons</b>	\$ state definitely make it difficult to fix.			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Does impact state budget.			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Firefighters, labor unions, fire districts, families, associations.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Any entity that has to pay for it.			

Issue		Dots		
<b>Problem Statement</b>	Labor groups have stronger voice and favor labor issues grievances tend to favor labor.	<b>Red</b>	<b>Green</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Background</b>	They take a long time to reach a decision interpret laws (arbitration) with bias to labor.	8	5	0
		<b>Total Dots</b>		
<b>Solution</b>	Ask leg committee/staff to research PERC authority and related issues.	13		
<b>Benefits</b>	That we might understand how to level the playing field.			
<b>Cons</b>	?			
<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	No?			
<b>Who Supports?</b>	Management.			
<b>Who Opposes?</b>	Labor.			